SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. III, No. 9 | P.O. Box 21123, Washington, D.C. 20009 | May 1, 1973

Energy: No Longer Banking on an R&D Solution

The key to . . . adequate energy and protecting the environment . . . will be a balanced and imaginative research and development program.
Presidential Energy Message, 1971

It is foolish and self-defeating to allocate (energy R&D) funds more rapidly than they can be effectively spent . . . When additional funds are found to be essential, I shall do everything I can to see that they are provided.
Presidential Energy Message, 1973

The two statements aren't worlds apart, but they are sufficiently distant to indicate that for the R&D community, the message in last week's Energy Message is that the administration isn't going to go the Manhattan Project or Apollo route in a quest for a solution to the "energy crisis."

In fact, the Message, which drew little praise from any quarter, is essentially a soporific document that, according to one former White House aide who was close to energy affairs, "simply twiddles the dials but doesn't do anything fundamental." In the words of the Message, we face a "challenge," but not a "crisis," and the proposals that it makes reflect that diagnosis.

With R&D consigned to providing a solution for the longrun, the here-and-now remedies consist mainly of expanding domestic production and luring more foreign fuels to this country by raising

(Continued on page 2)

HEW Forms Grant Appeals Board

HEW grantees who believe they have been mistreated by agency officials will be able to appeal their cases to a new Grant Appeals Board, effective May 21. The appeals board, which had been formally proposed late last year (SGR, Vol. II, No. 18), received "universally favorable" comment from interested parties, according to a statement published in the *Federal Register* on April 20.

The new board is not designed to hear appeals from scientists whose grant proposals were rejected. Instead, it is empowered to adjudicate disputes between scientists who already have a grant and the bureaucrats who administer that grant. The board can review such matters as allowable expenditures and termination of a grant because the grantee allegedly failed to comply with terms and conditions. It has jurisdiction over the grantees of such agencies as NIH, NIMH, NIE, OE, HSMHA, and FDA. The board's decision is final unless the head of the relevant agency takes specified steps to reverse it.

In Brief

Response of an OST alumnus when asked if his shop had shared in the Watergate episode: "No, they didn't trust us enough for anything as important as that." To which he added, "If we had been involved, do you think they'd have been using stone age electronics?" a reference to the relatively primitive eavesdropping devices installed in the Democratic headquarters.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has decreed that fisherman may no longer equip porpoises with radio transmitters to signal the presence of schools of tuna. According to a NOAA announcement, porpoises frequently cavort above tuna schools, and some high-technology fisherman have been placing 15-mile range radio transmitters on their backs.

Techniques for compiling the gross national product (GNP), perhaps the murkiest and most often used figure in political and economic arguments these days, are going to be reviewed by a non-governmental advisory committee that is being set up by the Office of Management and Budget. Present methods, says OMB, are "deficient in accuracy, completeness, or timeliness."

The Federation of American Scientists has proposed a solution to the problem of political dissidents seeking to have a say at scientific meetings. "The hotel, rather than the scientific society, should have the responsibility for deciding what is courteous and non-disruptive," FAS suggests in a policy statement.

Dept. of Timely Recognition: Donald Wills Douglas Sr., 81, founder of Douglas Aircraft, has been awarded the National Academy of Sciences $4000 Award in Aeronautical Engineering "in recognition of his contributions to aviation."

Attributed to Dzherman Gvishiana, son-in-law of Premier Kosygin and deputy chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Science and Technology: "We've advised the Egyptian army to follow the Russian tradition. Retreat and wait for winter."

ENERGY CRISIS *(Continued from page 1)*

prices, lowering protective trade barriers, and cutting corners on the administrative procedures that have enabled environmentalists to thwart the nuclear power program, the Alaska pipeline and refinery construction around the nation. (According to Treasury Secretary Shultz, only *one* refinery has been constructed in the US since 1965.)

As far as research is concerned, there is a good deal of self-congratulation for a 50-percent expansion from the relatively low, nuclear-dominated base that existed when the 1971 message was issued, but whether we are confronted by a "challenge" or a "crisis," the budgetary figures fail to match the rhetoric of the Message. Thus, the President states, "I urge that highest national priority be given to expanded development and utilization of our coal resources," which are elsewhere referred to as "our most abundant and least costly domestic source of energy." But an accompanying table of planned expenditures lists total coal activities for the coming fiscal year at $119 million, compared with $475 million for nuclear fission and $88 million for nuclear fusion—out of a total energy R&D budget of $771 million.

The 1971 Message states, "I have asked my Science Adviser . . . to make a detailed assessment of all of the technological opportunities in this (overall energy) area and to recommend additional projects which should receive priority attention."

Out of that presidential request came 11 studies, only one of which has been made public, *Solar Energy as a National Resource*, produced by a combined NSF/NASA study group. It recommended a 15-year solar R&D program, with an average annual cost of about $36 million. Next year's budget for solar energy research is $12.2 million, almost a three-fold increase over the present annual sum, but scarcely in the range that suggests a sense of urgency. The other studies, whatever their status may be, have not been heard of publicly.

The 1971 Message proudly proclaimed a major increase in research funds for stack gas cleansing, but, from deep inside the bureaucracy the word is that a major portion of the money has been quietly impounded by the Office of Management and Budget.

Though the latest message addresses itself to "energy conservation," the approach here is extremely cautious. Thus, enlarging the confusion over who's in charge of what, the President has directed that the Interior Department create an Office of Energy Conservation "to coordinate the energy conservation programs which are presently scattered throughout the Federal establishment. This office will conduct research and work with consumer and environmental groups in their efforts to educate consumers on ways to get the greatest return on their energy dollar."

Meanwhile, the Department of Commerce, working with the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency, has been put in charge of developing "a voluntary system of energy efficiency labels for major home appliances."

Nothing is said about strongarming the automotive industry into producing more energy-efficient vehicles. Rather, in line with the challenge-rather-crisis appraisal, the Message notes that "All workers and consumers can help by continually saving energy in their day-to-day activities: by turning out lights, tuning up automobiles, reducing the use of air conditioning and heating, and purchasing products which use energy efficiently."

Administratively the most far-reaching proposal in the Message is the resurrection of Nixon's first-term proposal for the creation of a new government department, originally referred to as the Department of Natural Resources and now re-christened the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. Details of the new scheme are soon to be delivered to Congress, but they are said to resemble the old one, which called for amalga-

(Continued on page 3)

Schultz on Energy R&D

Congressional proposals for a big-spending R&D approach to the "energy crisis" have found no favor with the administration, as indicated in the following excerpts from Treasury Secretary George P. Shultz's April 18 press briefing on the President's Energy Message to Congress:

". . . we must be willing, as it says in the Message, to spend the money that can be effectively used in this (energy R&D) area. And as we develop and find effective ways to use the money, then we will look around and we will find the money.

"Now, there has been a very rapid buildup in R&D expenditures in the energy field on the part of the Federal Government, and no doubt that will continue. We must, however, not just simply throw a lot of money out there, but have a good idea of what that money is going to be spent for and have a sense that it is going to be spent effectively.

"I would say also in connection with the R&D efforts that it is important for us to organize this in such a way that we have a balance between the private sector and the public sector . . .

"A billion dollars or so per year are spent by the private sector in this area . . . and it is important to keep that alive and keep a good interaction between public and private efforts and not have the Federal Government just come in and sort of pre-empt the field."

DoD Still Dodging Rainmaking Inquiry

Senator Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.) is still trying to draw out the Defense Department on whether the US employed rainmaking for military purposes in Southeast Asia, but the standard reply remains, in effect, that it's none of your business.

Pell, who has introduced a resolution (S. Res. 71) calling for an international ban on environmental and geophysical warfare, placed in the March 8 *Congressional Record* a letter to President Nixon from Marvin L. Goldberger, chairman of the Federation of American Scientists, urging the administration to come clean on the subject.

A "Dear Murph" reply was sent by John S. Foster, Jr., the outgoing chief of Defense Research and Engineering, which took the standard line that "Certain aspects of our work in the weather modification area relate directly to national security and are classified. I am not at liberty to discuss these aspects in a public letter." Foster added that "recognizing ... that information flow between the Executive and Legislative Branches is fundamental to the ability of our Government to make appropriate policy, the Secretary of Defense has kept the Chairmen of the Senate and House Armed Services and Appropriations Committees fully informed on classified aspects of work in this area."

What is clear, however, from fragmentary reports is that short of dipping into the nuclear and biological weapons inventory, the US threw everything in its arsenal at the other side in Vietnam and there is no reason to believe that malicious rainmaking was excluded.

ENERGY CRISIS *(Continued from page 2)*

mating many natural resource components of Interior, Agriculture, and the civilian power programs of the AEC under one roof.

As far as the AEC is concerned, the proposal must get past Rep. Chet Holifield (D-Calif.), congressional daddy of the fast breeder reactor. As chairman of the House Government Operations Committee, Holifield is in the right spot to block any presidential reorganization plan. The word from his staff is that he plans to hold hearings on presidential reorganization authority, starting sometime in the next few weeks, and that in the course of these hearings, he expects to take a look at the newly proposed department. In any case, the impression is that Holifield is not hurrying.

Meanwhile, Rep. Mel Price (D-Ill.), who became the senior House member on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy when Holifield shrewdly left the Committee to be in position to intercept Nixon's reorganization plans, had the following to say about the latest Energy Message:

"Realizing that nuclear energy development has been taking most of the Federal funds for research and development in the energy field, I am concerned that with the relatively severe short-term energy problem we face—mainly over the next two or three decades—some will advance the argument that funds from the nuclear program should be diverted to areas such as improving our utilization of indigenous fossil fuels. This, of course, would be fatal. In fact, the nuclear program is not even now receiving the funds it should receive in order to assure maximum progress."

Nixon concludes his Message with the upbeat observation that "Whenever we have been confronted with great national challenges in the past, the American people have done their duty. I am confident we shall do so now."

Perhaps they will, but as far as the administration doing its duty, there's a lot to be desired. —DSG

Study Confirms Hiring Lag For Women in Universities

A study just released by the US Office of Education confirms the oft-made charge that women receive a bad deal in the academic marketplace.

Figures compiled by OE's National Center for Educational Statistics show that women comprise only 22.5 percent of the nation's 254,930 full-time college and university teachers, their average salary is nearly $2,500 below that of their male equivalents, and only 9.5 percent of the women faculty members are full professors, compared with 25.5 percent of the men.

The nationwide study, covering the current school year, found that the salary gap is widest in universities, where the average male salary is $15,829, compared with $12,325 for women. The difference was smallest in two-year colleges, where the average for men was $12,889 and $11,862 for women.

Although strictly comparable data are not available from earlier periods, the OE report indicates that the proportion of women has not changed significantly in academic employment over the past decade. A study of universities and some four-year institutions placed female employment for 1962-3 at 19.6 percent of the total, compared with 20.6 percent for the same institutions in 1972-73. However, there has been a sharp increase in the proportion of women in the rank of instructor; they now total 43.5 percent, compared with 30.9 percent of all instructors 10 years ago.

Carnegie Study Sees Universities in Peril

The nation's research-oriented universities are in precarious financial condition as a result of federal budget cuts, and their future as research institutions is threatened.

That is one of the major conclusions to emerge from the latest study sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education as part of its massive review of the problems and prospects of higher education.

The 100-page report, entitled *The New Depression in Higher Education—Two Years Later*, was prepared by Earl F. Cheit, professor of business administration at the University of California at Berkeley, who is currently on leave to serve as a program officer at the Ford Foundation.

Two years ago Cheit reported on the financial condition of 41 colleges and universities of varying types in a report which the Carnegie Commission hailed as "a landmark book." The findings of that earlier study led the Carnegie Commission to project that two-thirds of all colleges and universities in the nation were in financial difficulty or headed that way.

Now Cheit has taken a follow-up look at the same 41 institutions and concluded that most (though not all) have managed to stave off financial erosion through "extraordinary" cost-control measures, with the result that they have reached a state of "fragile stability" but face an uncertain future.

The situation is marked by diversity, with no single pattern for the way institutions have been hit by the financial crisis or have responded to it. But the research universities have generally been "affected most adversely of all," according to Clark Kerr, chairman of the commission, "yet they, in particular, are most widely related to the national welfare."

Here is how Cheit describes the plight of the public and private institutions with major research programs:

"As a group, the research universities seem to be in the greatest state of concern about their future. The public institutions are somewhat demoralized about the qualitative leveling to which they fear they will be subject. The private universities, even those financially secure, have doubts about their future as research institutions. This is a fear born of restrictive federal policies toward funding graduate education and toward science, especially basic research.

"The federal budget proposed for fiscal 1974 phases out hospital construction grants, regional medical and community mental health center programs, training grants of the National Institutes of Health and National Institutes of Mental Health, social work training programs, capitation grants to schools for veterinarians, optometrists, and pharmacists, and institutional support for schools of public health and allied health fields.

"Elimination of these programs presents serious new financial setbacks for most large universities. The University of California system, for example, estimates that over a three-year period it faces the loss of $80 million as a result of these program cuts. New York University, already under great pressure to bring its books into balance, suddenly faces an additional deficit of several million dollars in its medical facilities due to these proposed changes. These are not special examples. All research universities with major medical facilities are facing similar problems."

The plight of NYU, classified as a "leading regional research university," is especially severe. The university had to borrow to cover a $5 million deficit in 1970-71; its estimated deficit for 1972-73 will exhaust the unrestricted endowment; and the university has been forced to sell its University Heights campus. Other regional research universities are in similar trouble. Two years ago Saint Louis University reported it had closed its dental school, four engineering departments, and an aeronautical sciences college and was operating its medical school on one-third its previous budget. Tulane had dropped doctoral programs in six fields. And the most prestigious of the nation's universities—the "national research universities"—were, and are, in serious financial binds (see "Budget Traumas," page 5).

Cheit concludes that while most of the 41 institutions he surveyed have managed to reach fiscal stability over the past two years, the stability is "fragile" because it is the result of cost savings that can't be long sustained or duplicated—namely, the freezing of salaries, postponement of maintenance or replacement of equipment or facilities, and the elimination of departments, research units or, in the case of NYU, an entire campus. The future of these universities, says Cheit, will be increasingly shaped by "events outside the campus and beyond its control"—such as the level of federal, state, and private support of education, and the trend in prices.

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT, ©1973 by Science & Government Report, Inc. All rights reserved. Daniel S. Greenberg, Publisher; Philip M. Boffey, Managing Editor; Bettina Conner, Production Manager. Published 22 times per year at 1629 Columbia Road, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. Subscription rate, $35 a year; overseas airmail subscription, $45. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C. Vol. III, No. 9, May 1, 1973.

Budget Traumas at Seven Major Universities

Here's how the seven "national research universities" studied by Cheit have fared in recent years:

Berkeley was judged to be "in financial difficulty" in Cheit's 1971 report, a designation which meant it had been forced to make cuts affecting "essential program or quality." The student-faculty ratio was rising, a research institute in the social sciences had been eliminated, seven other research units (including earthquake engineering and urban social problems) were operating without a regular support budget, an institute on race and community relations was only partially funded, plans for a new medical school had been postponed, proposed new courses had been deferred, freshman seminars had been cut, the summer quarter was eliminated, the number of graduate students and teaching assistants was reduced, and administrative posts were cut.

Now the situation has deteriorated even further. The student-faculty ratio has jumped to 17 to 1 compared with 15 to 1 in the late 1960s, a ratio which is "among the highest in the nation for a major public university with doctoral responsibilities." Graduate enrollments have been reduced 15 per cent, two high-cost specialist departments and one research institute have been terminated, two major computers have been taken out of service, library service has been reduced, student and administrative services have been trimmed, low-enrollment courses have been eliminated, the size of freshman sections has been boosted 5 per cent, limits have been set on community service and research programs, and financial aid programs have leveled off.

Berkeley believes it can maintain standards "if the present fragile resource base is not further eroded, "but it projects further deterioration in three years if present trends continue."

University of Chicago had been "headed for financial trouble" two years ago, is worse off now, and will remain "about the same" three years hence if present trends continue. In the original study, the university expected a large deficit that would necessitate using endowment principal. Now it has taken a number of steps to boost income and curb costs. In the largest and most complicated area of the university—the biological sciences division, medical school, hospitals and clinics—expenditures have been brought under "line item" control, with centralized oversight.

Harvard was "headed for financial trouble" in the first study, but is "better" now and expects to be "about the same" in three years. In the first study, Harvard reported "relentless" cost increases (operating costs rose an average of $12 million a year during the 1960s) and losses of federal support. Arts and Sciences was operating at a deficit, cutbacks had "severely weakened" the school of education, school of design, and divinity school, while public health, medical school, and engineering areas were "threatened." But now, Harvard says it is in "sound financial condition" with its $1.35 billion endowment and reserves intact, existing deficits expected to turn around without invasion of capital, and most cost-income relationships stabilizing.

University of Michigan had been "headed for financial trouble" two years ago, remains "about the same" now, but expects to be in worse condition three years hence if present trends continue. Currently, the university reports that inflation is a problem, a serious shortage of funds for student aid exists, university reserves in the educational budgets have been used up, a shortage exists in funds for equipment replacements, laboratory renovations and library books, and the drop in federal support for graduate students is serious.

University of Minnesota was "headed for financial trouble" two years ago, is worse off now, and expects to be even worse off three years hence. The medical school is in particular trouble because it is chronically underfunded by the state and has been hit by federal cutbacks. Resources gained from retrenchment in other parts of the university have been reallocated to the health sciences area.

Stanford had been in grave financial difficulty before, is recovering now, and expects to be "about the same" in three years. The university cut $1 million from its original 1970-71 budget but still wound up with a deficit of $1.4 million. The annual deficits have since been reduced to $600,000 in 1972-73 under a five-year plan to bring income and expense into balance. Thus far the university has made budget reductions of $4.5 million; it contemplates $1.5 million more. Some 39 faculty and 48 nonfaculty positions have been eliminated, though others have been added, keeping faculty-staff size about constant. A $300 million, five-year fundraising campaign has been launched.

University of Texas at Austin was "not in trouble" two years ago, but it's somewhat worse off now, and expects things to deteriorate a bit more in three years. The university can operate for one or two more years with essentially level funding without adverse effect, but beyond two years sees "very serious problems" if state and federal support does not rise to overcome inflation.

Nixon Sets Up White House National Energy Office

When President Nixon earlier this year decreed the demise of the White House Office of Science and Technology on the grounds that he didn't need it, veteran observers of the Washington scene predicted that sooner or later bits and pieces of OST's capabilities would be reinstated at the old stand in the Executive Office Building.

Well, it's happening sooner, even before June 30, the official departure date for OST.

In connection with his Energy Message, Nixon issued an Executive order stating, "There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President a National Energy Office," the functions of which are remarkably similar to the energy role handled by OST.

Among its duties are to "assure the development of comprehensive plans and programs to insure the availability of adequate and dependable supplies of energy," and to "make recommendations to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget concerning proposed funding of energy programs and activities."

The head of the office is Charles DiBona, an Annapolis graduate, and former chief of the Center

(Continued on page 8)

Rescue Try for NIH Training Grants

Efforts to salvage at least some of the graduate training programs that are scheduled for extinction at the National Institutes of Health have gained momentum in Congress and in the Executive Branch.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson (D-Wash.), chairman of the appropriations subcommittee for Labor-HEW, has indicated that he hopes to add $300 million to the Administration's proposed fiscal 1974 budget for biomedical research at NIH, a category which includes the training grants and fellowships that are due to be phased out as all existing students complete their training.

And, on the fringes of the Executive Branch, Benno C. Schmidt, the New York investment banker who heads the President's Cancer Advisory Panel, reports that he has persuaded White House officials to hear further arguments on why at least some training grants are needed to support the expanding national crusade against cancer.

Schmidt told a recent meeting of the cancer panel that he believes about 5 per cent of the budget should be devoted to training, which would mean about $25 million out of the National Cancer Institute's proposed budget of $500 million in fiscal 1974.

Schmidt made it clear that he will not try to restore the entire NIH training program, but only such parts as are relevant to cancer. He also indicated that he may simply seek permission to reprogram existing cancer funds instead of asking for a budget increase, on the theory that this will be more palatable to Administration budget-makers. Even so, he expects an uphill battle. "It's a little hard to find anything that hasn't, in one way or another, already been said," he laments. Still, as a successful businessman who cannot be dismissed as a self-interested scientist, Schmidt is deemed to have as good a chance as anybody of winning a White House reprieve for graduate training.

In Print

Recent publications of more than routine interest.

John Diebold, "Business, Government and Science: The Need for a Fresh Look," *Foreign Affairs*, April, 1973. The author, chairman of the Diebold Group, Inc., international management consultants, predicts that because of lower labor costs, underdeveloped nations will increasingly play host to new manufacturing industries, and warns that the US should avoid the temptation to restrict the export of new technologies and know-how "because that is the export industry by which we may live." (Reprints, 1-24 copies at 75 cents each: *Foreign Affairs*, 58 E. 68th St., New York, N.Y. 10021.)

The Government of Science in Britain, readings edited by J. B. Poole and Kay Andrews, a broad selection of official documents and articles, 1875 to the present, that provide an excellent overview of how Britain has developed and managed its scientific resources. (358 pages, approximately $12.25, Widenfeld and Nicolson, 5 Winsley St., Oxford Circus, London W1, England.)

Science, Technology, and Innovation, abridged version of a Battelle Columbus Laboratories study performed for NSF, tracing the origins of the heart pacemaker, hybrid grains, electrophotography, input-output analysis, organophosphorous insecticides, oral contraceptives, magnetic ferrites, and video taperecording. Among the blows at conventional wisdom: "The time span from first conception to first realization is not growing shorter, as far as can be judged from our limited sample, and in contrast to widely held ideas." (The abridged version, 33 pages, as well as Battelle's complete report, are available from: Division of Science Resources Studies, NSF, 1800 G St., NW, Wash., D.C. 20550.)

Stever Creating Policy Staff for New Advisory Role

The science advisory apparatus now being organized inside the National Science Foundation is shaping up as a genteel "ask-if-you-need-help" operation that is deliberately designed to stay out of the way of the major powerhouses on the federal R&D scene. That's the impression that emerges from an SGR interview with NSF Director H. Guyford Stever, who, under the title of Science Adviser, takes over many of the functions of the White House Office of Science and Technology when OST is formally dissolved on June 30.

"Certain parts of the federal government are in very good shape when it comes to running their programs and obtaining advice," Stever said. "Space, medicine, and defense, for example, have strong homes and don't need advice from us. On the other hand, the emerging civil science systems lack tradition and need help."

Stever said that many organizational details are yet to be worked out, but that he plans to set up an Office of Science Policies, with a 10-member professional staff, to assist him in his role as Science Adviser. In addition to the OSP staff, for which a director will soon be announced, he also plans to draw staff support from various components of the Foundation, including a newly established Energy Task Force, headed by Paul Donovan, who was chief of energy in NSF's program of Research Applied to National Needs; RANN itself, and the newly established Experimental R&D Incentives and R&D Assessment programs. "We've got vast resources inside the Foundation," he said, "and hundreds of outside advisers who regularly work with us," adding, "With respect to advice, we have a very productive community."

In January, following publication of the presidential reorganization plan that abolished OST and designated the NSF Director as Science Adviser, Stever said he planned to establish a "Science Policy Council within the Federal Government." This was generally interpreted to mean a reprieve for the Federal Council for Science and Technology (FCST), a sort of sub-cabinet of Federal R&D officials, appended to OST and chaired by the OST Director. Stever has now indicated to SGR that, while he has not arrived at a final decision, he has had some reservations about preserving the FCST.

"What we've found," he said, "is that the main body (the Federal Council itself) is not so important as many of its subgroups. A lot of good work has been performed under FCST auspices by coordinating committees for the atmospheric sciences, oceanography, and other inter-agency activities. Then there are interagency committees that serve a particular agency, such as the committee that advises the RANN program. Finally, there are ad hoc committees that are put together for specific problems. All of these are very useful and we want to preserve the means for using them. But I'm tired of standing committees that meet whether or not they have anything to meet about. Something is going to survive from the Federal Council, but at this point I'm not certain what it will be."

On federal funding for research, Stever said, "It's not the worst thing to have a tight economy." In the energy field, for example, he said, "The word is out, 'Bring us good ideas, and you'll get the money.' But there's no set amount that's announced beforehand. What we have to do is come up with good ideas. I think this is a good arrangement, provided that it's accompanied by understanding and acceptance. I'm not at all pessimistic about doing it this way."

Stever's conception of his role must be viewed in terms of the administration that holds authority over R&D. Nixon and his budgetmakers are not well disposed to mavericks, big spenders (outside of the military area) or federal officials who acquire a public identity (with the exception of Dr. Kissinger.)

The reorganization plan specifically excluded military research from Stever's purview, and political reality puts space and bio-medical affairs similarly out of bounds. Any attempt to intrude into these territories will either fail or bring retribution. The demise of OST can in large part be attributed to the feeling of Nixon's close associates that it was poking into matters that were none of its business. The pattern that Stever is apparently going to follow is far more passive than the traditional OST style, but at least it assures some vestige of a science advisory apparatus in the federal government.

Science & Government Report
Kalorama Station
Box 21123B
Washington, D.C. 20009

☐ Renew my subscription
☐ Enter my subscription

for ☐ two years, $65; or ☐ one year, $35.
(Overseas airmail, $10 additional per year.)
☐ check enclosed; ☐ please bill.

☐ Send a complimentary copy to:

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Bill to Halt Selective NSF Cuts is Approved

The House subcommittee on science, research and development has reported out an authorization bill that would prevent selective impoundment of National Science Foundation funds desipte assertions by NSF leaders that the legislation could have "a devastating effect" on the agency's programs.

The legislation, known as H.R. 3610, was introduced by Rep. John Davis (D-Ga.), the subcommittee chairman, in an effort to forestall repetition of the situation that occurred in fiscal 1973 when the Nixon Administration impounded more than $60 million in NSF funds, roughly 10 per cent of the agency's budget, and concentrated these cuts in such areas as graduate student support and science education.

The Davis bill would not prevent impounding, but it divides the NSF budget into numerous categories and requires that any impounding be allocated proportionally among these categories.

The bill, as approved unanimously by the subcommittee on April 11, has been modified somewhat to counter objections by NSF that it would require "major disrupting changes" in the way the agency conducts business with its awardees. The requirement that funds must be obligated proportionally among the various budget categories has been made slightly more flexible by increasing the percentage deviation allowable between categories and by exempting NSF's management expenses from this requirement. Moreover, the bill now applies only to obligations (commitments to spend money) and not to actual expenditures, a change which will ease NSF's bookkeeping problems.

The total amount of money recommended in the bill represents a compromise. Davis had originally proposed that NSF be authorized $59 million more than the Administration had requested, but the legislation approved by the subcommittee calls for only $30.3 million more.

Some $10.8 million of that boost would go to graduate student support on the theory that "The much discussed over-supply of scientists and engineers seems to be a phenomenon temporary in nature and fast disappearing. There are predictions of significant shortages in some disciplines in a few years." Another $10 million would go to basic research.

The legislation is expected to be approved by the full House Committee on Science and Astronautics with only minor revisions and stands a good chance of passage in the House. It has been endorsed by almost all major educational associations.

ENERGY OFFICE *(Continued from page 6)*

for Naval Analysis. DiBona joined the White House staff as a special consultant on energy affairs after opposition developed on Capitol Hill to Nixon's plans to appoint him as chief of the Selective Service System. He is a bright, affable fellow, but is without standing in the energy mafia that has grown up in recent years, which may have something to do with the White House decision to appoint him. DiBona's staff will number about six professionals, including William McCormack, a physicist who handled energy matters at OST.

Situated above DiBona will be a newly created Special Committee on Energy, consisting of Nixon's own triumverate of super assistants, John D. Ehrlichman, Henry Kissinger, and George P. Shultz. DiBona, says the Executive Order, will report to the President through them.

Science & Government Report
Kalorama Station
Box 21123
Section B
Washington, D.C. 20009

NEWSLETTER–
Please expedite delivery directly to addressee

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.